

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
December 12, 2001
9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
NWIFC Conference Center
Minutes

Attendees:

Bresler, Helen	DOE
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Cramer, Darin	DNR
Dominguez, Larry	DNR Small Landowner Office
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser
Hansen, Craig	USFWS
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Hersh, Mark	EPA
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
Lippke, Bruce	University of Washington
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	CMER Co-chair
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC
McNaughton, Geoff	Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Parks, Dave	DNR
Pavel, Joseph	NWIFC
Peterson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe
Quinn, Tim	CMER Co-chair
Raines, Mary	NWIFC
Rowe, Blake	Longview Fibre
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR

The minutes from November will be sent out in final draft form and approved at the January meeting. All comments received thus far have been incorporated.

CMER Budget Update: McNaughton distributed an updated budget spreadsheet that is very close to complete. A new column has been inserted showing the previous year and where money has actually been applied. Also, a DNR tracking number has been assigned to all projects. WDFW overhead has increased by 5%, which is not reflected in this budget sheet. The ending balance is shown as negative \$154,000 but this is not correct because there is an additional \$223,000 of Bull Trout money being applied to the water typing projects. This money has not been incorporated into the budget yet because the actual distribution has not been determined. There may also be additional federal money in later years that we were not expecting. Please note that other Forests and Fish funding is listed at the bottom of this sheet and most of this funding is not dedicated to the CMER process.

SAGs need to review this sheet for accuracy and completeness. McNaughton noted two studies that have not been tracked to date. One is “Statistical Support to Water Typing Model” at a cost of \$63,360 and the other is “Last Fish (Terrapin Environmental)” at a cost of \$63,661. The Atterbury Landowner Data purchase was also not on the list of projects, but Quinn said that DOE may be planning to pay for this study

(McNaughton will check into this). Martin asked if we are showing expenditures for the 2001 fiscal year or if we are showing allocations. This needs to be clear in the spreadsheet.

One other point to bear in mind is that there is a legislative proposal to suspend all research and development projects due to funding shortfalls. McNaughton said he is seeking grants to help us if this occurs and to add to available funding in the future.

SAG Assignment: SAGs are asked to carefully go through this budget and make sure project monies are accurately reflected and that all approved projects are on the list. Also, if your project costs will be significantly less than the spreadsheet indicates, provide that information to McNaughton. The deadline for this is December 26.

SAG Budget Update: Quinn said this will be a recurring agenda item to provide updates on status, problems or issues with approved projects.

RSAG: Hunter said that there are some issues with the Type F and N Effectiveness Project that the group is finding it difficult to reach consensus around. If they cannot agree, the \$76,000 allocated to this project will not be spent. The Growth and Yield protocol is still under development and they will have another update next month. Quinn added that the PIP issues should be resolved by Christmas.

LWAG: MacCracken said that LWAG is \$10,000 short on the Seep Characterization and the Amphibian resampling projects.

McNaughton added that the overhead on the state general fund had gone up in 2002. It was calculated based upon the total budget in 2001, but was calculated based upon total staff FTEs starting in 2002.

SRC Update and Requests: Martin said that McNaughton updated CMER on the current status of reviews and asked for new requests. McNaughton said the RMZ resampling and TFW 118 Slope Stability projects are currently under review, but the RMZ resample review is behind schedule. He also informed the group that Dan Vogt has activated an Internet site at the UW where general information on all these reviews is listed.

Martin asked why the RMZ review is running late. Lippke said that, paid or unpaid, the history of reviews is that they face delays. McNaughton added that if the University is grossly late, we will not pay them. Quinn suggested that we contact alternate reviewers if delays are too lengthy. McNaughton added that we need to forward more names of reviewers, which will help minimize delays.

The SRC staff currently consists of one lead editor and two assistant editors. MacCracken said that we envisioned subject matter editors as well. McNaughton said that this has not been set up yet. Heide suggested that the University should search for reviewers to minimize CMER involvement in the process. McNaughton will ask the University to go and seek reviewers and to find some subject matter editors.

There are no new SRC requests at this time.

Handbook Update: McNaughton said that an outline has been drafted and is out for review. It still needs work and comments continue to come in. He reiterated that there are many people who want this group to be much more formalized. We need this formal process committed to paper. McNaughton also thanked Allen Pleus for his work on this. Pleus distributed an organizational chart that outlines some of the groups and their key participants and functions. This is in draft form and comments are needed. Please submit them directly to McNaughton.

Quinn provided an update on the MDT as well. They are counting on SAGs to provide the prescription-monitoring piece. The MDT is concentrating on trend monitoring and intensive monitoring. The MDT will conclude in spring of 2002 and will try to get a conceptual draft of their paper to the Governor's Independent Science Panel (ISP) soon. The draft is going to the ISP because they are overseeing all

monitoring in the state and having their input during the design phase will help us when we get to the implementation phase. The MDT needs the workplan from the SAGs to help them move forward. Hunter asked if this should include projects that have not been prioritized. Quinn said to only include what you have.

Cost Benefit Analysis: McNaughton said that, in the handbook, there is a placeholder for CBA. CMER must discuss whether it is appropriate to weigh in on training, rule implementation and CBA. There are strong views on the CBA issue. McNaughton asked for discussion on this topic and not necessarily a decision today. Sturhan asked, in what capacity CMER would be providing this service? McNaughton said it has come up during the PIP process and may come up with other projects as well. We do weigh studies against each other for prioritization purposes, but this is not CBA. Hansen asked if we can answer that when we look at management implications of studies and suggested that at that time it would be a policy issue.

Lippke provided some examples for the group. The University has done studies on small landowner lands. They have shown that the forest easement program does mitigate the losses of leaving the standing timber but does nothing to encourage people not to convert. Another example is the pre-commercial thin in a core zone. There is no financial motivation to do these thinnings so some stands will never reach DFC.

Heide said that there will be economic analysis of any science forwarded to policy. Part of the question is whether that economic analysis needs to be formalized into a scientific process. Heide suggests that CMER not embark on formal CBA. Jackson also believes that CMER should not be doing CBA as it will cloud the natural and biological science issues.

Rowe said that economics is just as much of a science issue as any other issue here. However, we don't have the expertise to do economics and we will need a new SAG to accomplish this. You could do this while avoiding policy calls as the CBA job is just to determine how the costs and benefits compare and contrast to each other. The policy call is still made by policy.

McNaughton said that it may be that this is not an issue unless we are asked to do it. Bresler recommends that we resist doing it even if we are asked. They need to be kept separate. Raines said that she agrees with what people are saying and believes we could consider both conservative and less conservative treatments to aid in the CBA later. Pavel suggested that CBA may be part of the rule making process.

McNaughton agreed to summarize this discussion in the handbook.

Bull Trout tracking sheet: Craig Hansen distributed a BT tracking sheet to help people see where the USFWS bull trout monies are being applied. This is broken out on a project and sub project basis. They were allocated \$1.1 million for 2001 and are anticipating another \$1.1 million for 2002. Raines asked what projects are being directed by BTSAG and which ones are not. Hansen will make that distinction on the next version. Using the same titles as CMER uses was suggested as well. BTSAG will look at this sheet and will provide more detail for CMER.

BTSAG and USFWS will work together to determine how to distribute the \$223,000 and will inform CMER of their decision by December 26. Cramer said that the issue is that there is a GIS field collection effort and GIS support to the Statistics group. There has been confusion about whether the USFWS can fund the support for the Statistics group. As soon as this determination is made, then the distribution can be finalized.

2002 meeting schedule: Meetings will be held on the 3rd Thursday of each month. January 17 will be the first meeting and a regular schedule will be distributed shortly.

The Next Science Topic: Quinn reminded the group that CMER meetings will focus on science in the afternoons and topics are needed for future meetings. We will brainstorm for about five minutes on this.

Hunter suggested that study designs should also be included in this process. Pleus asked if this is a checkpoint for CMER. Martin said it is an information session only. The group can ask questions and get more information about various projects, but should join the SAG if they want to contribute to the project design or implementation. Presenters can frame unresolved issues during the science discussion if they want to but it is not the primary purpose of the session. Presenters may also wish to discuss management implications of their studies; again, this is not required. The primary audience is CMER, but policy committee representatives will be invited as well.

Suggestions include: MDT, Type F and N Effectiveness study, last fish/last habitat, RMZ resample project, roads monitoring program, slope stability hazard rating, DFC summary and status, amphibian sampling, seeps, research and eastside disturbance regimes.

Maybe it should be mandatory that as you finish a project or report, you present it to CMER. The January item is Last Fish / Last Habitat or Amphibian studies. Quinn and Martin will talk with Fransen and Cramer.

Last Fish / Last Habitat will be the topic in January. Thank you to ISAG for agreeing to present so quickly.

SAG Reports

UPSAG: With the approval of the worklist, through the FPB, a sub group is forming to work on the scope of work for the headwater literature review study. This group is intended to be interdisciplinary. If you are interested, please contact Joan Sias or Heather Shelan. Raines can give you their contact information.

RSAG: A proposed timeline for the type F/N effectiveness study has been drafted. They are planning fieldwork for next summer and would like to have the contractor in place by May 15. The study plan will need to move quickly in January to move into the SRC. RSAG will meet again next Monday. The other item is the last CMER staff position with NWIFC.

CMER Consensus: CMER approves the staff position and the job description, as drafted by RSAG, for a study implementation coordinator.

Schuett-hames added that we need to focus on how to utilize this person's time and we will need a process for SAGs to bring forward their ideas. He also said that, given his assessment of needs, the new staff person will not be able to facilitate all requests without help. Quinn suggested that ideas for use of this position should be brought forward to the next meeting.

RSAG will need at least one hour at the next meeting to talk about the study plan for the F/N effectiveness study.

BTSAG: Continued funding for the presence/absence protocol development was approved by the policy committee in early December. The FFPG asked BTSAG to answer some questions related to development as well. Site selection for the BTO development is a large issue.

LWAG: LWAG will be asking to use project development funds for two separate projects at the next meeting. This request will be written and distributed in advance for action at the January meeting.

SAGE: would like approval for the eastside nomograph RFP from CMER and will be sending it out for review.